

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and are not rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Accordingly, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance. **If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues, or believes that some or all of the claims are not in condition for allowance, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned to schedule a telephone Examiner Interview before any further actions on the merits.**

The applicants will now address each of the issues raised in the outstanding Office Action.

Objections

Claims 16, 21, 25, 44 and 49 are objected to because of minor informalities. The applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this objection in view of the following.

Although the applicants believe that these claims were worded properly as filed, they have amended as suggested by the Examiner to expedite prosecution of this application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 7-12, 14-16, 18-21, 23-31, 35-40, 42-44 and 46-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Moy, "Network Working Group RFC 1583," OSPF Version 2 (March 1994) ("the Moy paper"). The applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this ground of rejection in view of the following.

Independent claims 1, 11, 18, 23, 29, 39 and 46 have been amended to recite that a message (which may be sent by one node towards a neighbor node) includes forwarding liveness status information of at least **two different interfaces**. This feature is not taught by the Moy paper as applied by the Examiner. Thus, independent claims 1, 11, 18, 23, 29, 39 and 46, as amended, are not anticipated by the Moy paper. Since claims 2, 3 and 7-10 directly or indirectly depend from claim 1, since claims 12 and 14-16 depend from claim 11, since claims 19-21 depend from claim 18, since claims 24-28 directly or indirectly depend from claim 23, since claims 30, 31 and 35-38 directly or indirectly depend from claim 29, since claims 40 and 42-44 depend from claim 39, and since claims 47-49 depend from claim 46, these claims are similarly not anticipated by the Moy paper.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4-6, 13, 32-34 and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Moy paper, and further in view of Sandwick et al., "Network Working Group Internet Draft," Fast Liveness Protocol (FLIP)

(February 2000) ("the Sandwick paper"). The applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this ground of rejection in view of the following.

Claims 4-6, 13, 32-34 and 41 directly or indirectly depend from claims 1, 11, 29 and 39, respectively. Since the purported teachings of the Sandick paper do not compensate for the deficiency of the Moy paper with respect to claims 1, 11, 29 and 39 (discussed above), these claims are not rendered obvious by the Moy and Sandick papers, regardless of the purported teachings of the Sandick paper, and regardless of the presence or absence of an obvious reason to combine these references as proposed by the Examiner.

Claims 17, 22, 45 and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Moy paper, and further in view of Simpson, "Network Working Group RFC 1989," PPP Link Quality Monitoring (August 1996) ("the Simpson paper"). The applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this ground of rejection in view of the following.

Claims 17, 22, 45 and 50 depend from claims 11, 28, 39 and 46, respectively. Since the purported teachings of the Simpson paper do not compensate for the deficiency of the Moy paper with respect to claims 11, 28, 39 and 46 (discussed above), these claims are not rendered obvious by the Moy and Simpson papers, regardless of the purported teachings of the Simpson paper, and regardless of the presence or absence of an obvious reason to combine these references as proposed by the Examiner.


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the applicants request that the Examiner pass this application to issue.

Any arguments made in this amendment pertain **only** to the specific aspects of the invention **claimed**. Any claim amendments or cancellations, and any arguments, are made **without prejudice to, or disclaimer of**, the applicants' right to seek patent protection of any unclaimed (e.g., narrower, broader, different) subject matter, such as by way of a continuation or divisional patent application for example.

Respectfully submitted,

April 7, 2008



John C. Pokotylo, Attorney
Reg. No. 36,242
Tel.: (732) 936-1400

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper (and any accompanying paper(s)) is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent Office on the date shown below.

John C. Pokotylo

Type or print name of person signing certification


Signature

April 7, 2008
Date